

**Summary of Plenary Group Comments
Environmental Work Group Resource Action Recommendation**

Presentation/RA	Comment
	<p>Q: Fish passage items are classified as #3 suggest that they be moved to category #2?</p> <p>A: We can discuss at re-categorization in EWG and potentially address through adaptive management</p>
	<p>Q: Where is there a need for more Large Woody Debris? Is the potential to add more Large Woody Debris?</p> <p>A: Yes, the issue is under discussion. Study reports have identified specific locations.</p>
	<p>Q: Diversion Pool fishery needs improvement, is that possible to discuss.</p> <p>A: Yes. Will add it to the EWG discussion.</p>
	<p>Q: Thanks to Terry and group for guidance, discussion and a serious look at issues.</p>
	<p>Q: Will the LULMA Work Group provide rough cost estimates?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p>
	<p>Q: When will the EWG Resource Actions be forwarded to the Plenary Group for its review?</p> <p>A: EWG preference is to send a complete package but may begin submitting to the Plenary Group on a program-by-program basis, starting March 1, 2004.</p>
	<p>Q: EWG Resource Action matrix is missing numbers.</p> <p>A: Facilitator said that matrix would be posted on the web site as part of the meeting summary.</p>
	<p>Q: Have Sturgeon experts changed their opinion on jumping Sturgeon?</p> <p>A: They have a limited jumping capability.</p> <p>NMFS: We have conducted research on Sturgeon passage and while they do indeed jump nobody has demonstrated that they can jump over a plunging weir</p>